



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tioned. Among the phrases in which *chip* occurs I fail to find *knock a chip off one's head*, but perhaps English boys are not as familiar with the custom as American. It is interesting to note that Milton uses *chip of the old block*, and Bishop Sanderson has *chip of the same block*, in a metaphorical sense.

We have a most interesting discussion of the two verbs *cleave*, to split, and *cleave*, to cling to, the former being originally a strong *u*-verb, and the latter a strong *i*-verb and also weak. Dr. Murray well says: "From the fourteenth century the inflexional forms of this verb [CLEAVE¹] have tended to run together with those of CLEAVE², 'to stick.' Though the latter was originally *clive*, it had also the variants *cleove*, *clève*, the latter of which at length prevailed; the two verbs having thus become identical in the present stem were naturally confused in their other inflexions." If the forms *cleve* and *clive*, which existed in the fourteenth century, could have been kept separate, this confusion might possibly have been avoided, but in language there is no place for the "might have been." We have to take it as it is, and try to explain the apparently arbitrary variations as best we can by known phonetic laws.

To the examples of *Clergy* in the sense of "learning, scholarship, science," I may add the following from Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, II 82, 10, which may come in well between the example from the *Metrical Homilies* (1325) and that from the *York Mysteries* (1440):

"In the cronique as I finde
Cham, whos labour is yet in minde,
Was he, which first the letters fonde
And wrote in Hebreu with his honde,
Of natural philosophy
He found first also the *clergy*."

This is a plain statement, according to Gower, that Ham not only invented the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, but discovered also the science of natural philosophy. (One cannot read a page of Gower without wishing that some English scholar who has access to the MSS would undertake a revision of Pauli's text, but I suppose it will be left for the inevitable German to do.) The last example of this use of *clergy* is from a dictionary of 1690 in the proverb: "An ounce of mother-wit is worth a pound of clergy," though Sydney Smith (1822) also quotes the proverb. But one cannot tell where to stop in turning over the leaves of this great dictionary. I can only again express the hope that it may be found practicable, by increasing the editorial staff, to issue the several parts at shorter intervals.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

A History of Elizabethan Literature. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1887.

A History of Eighteenth Century Literature (1660-1780). By EDMUND GOSSE, M.A. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1889.

Although not strictly "philological," the importance of the two volumes above mentioned may justify a brief notice in this Journal. An advertisement prefixed to the former work states that it "is intended to form the second

volume of a History of English Literature, divided into four main periods, each of which is entrusted to a writer who has made that period his particular study. The volume on the Earliest Period of English Literature has been undertaken by Mr. STOPPORD BROOKE, the volume dealing with the Literature of the Eighteenth Century by Mr. EDMUND GOSSE, and that on Modern Literature by Professor DOWDEN. It is hoped that these volumes may be issued at no very distant date."

As may be seen, Mr. Gosse has fulfilled his task; not so Mr. Brooke and Professor Dowden, so that I may be permitted to concur in the hope expressed in the concluding sentence of the advertisement. I may say in the beginning that I wish Mr. Gosse had imitated Mr. Saintsbury in prefixing an analytical table of contents to his volume. It is a great convenience to the reader to have the several subjects of a chapter at hand for reference, for no one can tell beforehand who besides "Pope" are treated in a chapter thus headed. As a matter of fact, Addison, Pomfret, and John Philips precede Pope, and Prior, Gay, Parnell, Ambrose Philips, Tickell, Somerville, Croxall, and Allan Ramsay follow him, in very brief notices, and we have no analysis of the contents of the twenty-five pages on Pope. This heaping-up of minor writers in brief notices is, too, a fault that may be found with both works, perhaps to a greater extent with Mr. Saintsbury's than with Mr. Gosse's book, for there were more *very* minor writers during that period. In a History of English Literature it does not seem to me to be necessary to include everybody who may have scribbled a scrap of prose or poetry. They have been consigned to oblivion for several centuries, and in oblivion they may well remain. They may possibly be included in dictionaries of authors, but not in histories of literature. As an extreme illustration of what I mean, I find in the contents of Mr. Saintsbury's tenth chapter on "Caroline Poetry" the name Montrose, and when I search that chapter to learn something about him, all I find is (p. 392): "I should not like to have to choose between Herrick and Milton's earlier poems; between Herrick, Carew, Crashaw, Montrose, Lovelace, and Suckling combined on the one hand, and *The Faërie Queene* on the other." I do not find him mentioned in any History of Literature accessible to me, but presumably James Grahame, Marquis of Montrose (1612-50), better known as a historical than as a literary character, who, Allibone tells us under Grahame, "wrote a number of poems," is referred to; so this entry serves as a mere index of mention. Others are treated at more or less length, but the space occupied by these might well have been given to the treatment of more prominent writers.

Mr. Saintsbury purposely pays little attention to "what some moderns call the 'bio-bibliographical' side of the matter," but I could wish that he had paid more, for one does not like to have to refer to one book for such details and to another for the criticism. He says: "My dates and my biographical facts I take for the most part from others." The biographical facts are scanty, and the dates are often given only in the index. I rather agree with Mr. Gosse, who, while apologizing for his profusion of dates, says: "I have the impression that dates, if reasonably treated, present a great assistance to the comparative student, and really should prevent, instead of causing, interruption"—and he is right, *me judice*. In studying literature we want to know the *man* as well as the *book*, and we cannot get at that without some knowledge of his life,

which the historian of literature should give. But after saying my say on these points, I must thank both of these authors for the additions which they have made to genuine criticism of English literature. Their names and styles are too well known to dwell on, but I could wish that Mr. Saintsbury had stricken out some of his French and other foreign terms and thus given us a purer English. Mr. Gosse seems to have pruned the exuberance of his style, as seen in some of his other works, and thus improved it.

The necessary brevity of this notice will not admit of an examination of the critical judgments of these authors, but I may call special attention to Mr. Saintsbury's criticism of Milton, both of his character and of his writings. After the fulsome eulogy that we often see bestowed upon Milton by critics, it is refreshing to meet with sentences like the following (p. 317): "On the whole Milton's character was not an amiable one, nor even wholly estimable." And here follows what is, in my opinion, a very just criticism of that character. Milton possessed all the egotism and the prejudices of the most partisan Puritan, and it is well that somebody has at last been found to say it. Mr. Saintsbury considers that in *Comus* "Milton's poetical power is at its greatest height," while Mr. Pattison ten years ago called *Lycidas* the "high-water mark of English poetry." But whatever may be true as to the comparative superiority of Milton's several poetical works, Mr. Saintsbury gives us a very just judgment of his prose, unless perhaps he overrates its merits. He says (p. 322): "There is no English prose before him, none save Taylor's and Browne's in his time, and absolutely none after him that can compare with the finest passages of these singular productions." That may be, but we cannot judge an author by his "finest passages," and the criticism that follows seems to me more judicious. Mr. Saintsbury does not minimize the faults of Milton's prose, but he considers it very fine notwithstanding. He says, however (p. 326): "It might be contended with some plausibility that this abundance of jewels, or purple patches" [a phrase of which Mr. S. is very fond, as it perpetually recurs], "brings into rather unfair prominence the slips of grammar and taste, the irregularities of thought, the deplorable attempts to be funny, the rude outbursts of bargee invective, which also occur so numerous." These certainly detract from excellence of style, and I rather prefer the simplicity of old Fuller, whom Mr. S. relegates to a minor place in "Caroline Prose," and the smoothness of Jeremy Taylor, when he is not talking of "the fringes of the north star," to the cumbrous sentences of Milton, even in the *Areopagitica*, that much over-praised work. This chapter, however, well deserves study, for Mr. S. limits himself here to a discussion of Milton, Taylor, Clarendon, Browne and Hobbes, and has given us some interesting criticism. I must refer to Mr. S.'s criticism of Ben Jonson, and especially of his prose style (pp. 218, 219), even though we have so little of it. He very rightly praises "the straightforward, vigorous English of these *Discoveries*," which contain "an admirable short tractate on style which exemplifies what it preaches; and a large number of other excellent things." It may be noted in passing that Mr. Swinburne, in his recent work, "A Study of Ben Jonson," is in full agreement with Mr. Saintsbury as to the excellence of Ben Jonson's prose. Attention may also be directed to what Mr. Saintsbury has said of Shakspeare's *Sonnets* (pp. 161-4) and the questions connected therewith. As Carlyle said of the authorship of

the Letters of Junius, "it doesn't matter the value of a brass farthing" who "Mr. W. H." was, or "the dark lady," or "the rival poet." Those who have abundance of leisure may busy themselves with these questions, but the ordinary reader will enjoy the *Sonnets* apart from them, and moreover will not consider that *all* of the *Sonnets* are equally enjoyable, as Shakspeare-maniacs are prone to do, who will not permit adverse criticism of any of them.

The limits of this notice will permit but a few remarks on Mr. Gosse's book. Without the fear of Mr. Collins before his eyes, Mr. Gosse starts out with giving Waller the credit for the introduction of the heroic couplet, and calls Denham "his first disciple" (p. 4), stating that he "had perceived and had accepted the reform suggested by Waller," and quoting Dryden's testimony to the effect that Denham followed Waller. Cowley's "Song" is pronounced "unnavigable," though his prose receives its due meed of praise: "Cowley's *Essays* should be read by every student of English prose." But most noticeable is his criticism of the *dui majores* of this period, Dryden and Pope, and especially a brief parallel between the two (pp. 24, 25 and p. 133), wherein Dryden very rightly takes precedence. Mr. Gosse discusses Pope at greater length than any other single writer, if I remember rightly, and is inclined to apologize for his faults, attributing them to his physical weakness (p. 132). But we cannot so easily excuse Pope's conduct, for he was, as Mr. Gosse acknowledges, "an unscrupulous and intriguing trickster." If one wishes a good account of the Pope-Addison episode, let him read and compare Mr. Stephen's Pope and Mr. Courthope's Addison in the "English Men of Letters" series, a series of literary biographies that gives a better idea of the *men*, as well as their works, than is elsewhere to be found in brief in English literature. Pope is rightly given credit for polishing the heroic couplet, a credit that no one wishes to deny him, but it may well be inquired, "Does that constitute a great poet?" and we are forced to concur in the apt criticism: "He has no romance, no spirituality, no mystery, and the highest regions of poetry he never so much as dreams of" (p. 133). We heartily sympathize too with what Mr. Gosse has to say of Dryden's prose (pp. 90-94): "He is the manliest, the most straightforward, the most authoritative prose writer of the age, and, in his long career of more than thirty years, he surveyed and laid out the whole estate of modern English prose"; and again: "He is not only a fine dramatist and a very lofty poet, but a great pioneer in prose criticism also." But for Dryden the Queen Anne writers would have found their task much more difficult, and the cultivation of English prose might have been postponed to a much later period.

We can generally agree with Mr. Gosse's criticisms, but I think he unduly depreciates Bolingbroke's style, i. e. judging from his *Letters on the Study of History*. He says (p. 174): "His boasted style, though unquestionably lucid, is slipshod and full of platitudes, grandiloquent and yet ineffectual." Now this seems to me to be going too far, for in the history of English prose Bolingbroke must be taken into account. I shall merely set opposite to it the judgment of a scholar, which appears to me more just. Professor Adamson says (*Enc. Brit.*, Vol. IV, p. 7): "Bolingbroke's philosophical writings are indeed insufferably wearisome, and it is only in them that his style ever flags and grows cumbersome, for his other writings are in many respects the perfection of English prose style, and can stand comparison even with the finished com-

positions of Addison." This reminds me that I may well direct attention also to what Mr. Gosse says of the characters and styles of Addison and Steele, without taking time to say more than that we might spare the word "meticulous" (p. 194), which Webster's "Unabridged" pronounces *obsolete*, and which is not found in dictionaries of lesser capacity. I sympathize too with what he says of Collins and Gray, especially with his remark (p. 235): "It may perhaps be allowed to be an almost infallible criterion of a man's taste for the highest forms of poetic art to inquire whether he has or has not a genuine love for the verses of William Collins." This parallel also seems to me well drawn: "While Gray was the greater intellectual figure of the two, the more significant as a man and a writer, Collins possessed something more thrilling, more spontaneous, as a purely lyrical poet." This agrees, *leniori modo*, with what Mr. Swinburne has said, with his usual extravagance (Ward's English Poets, Vol. III, p. 279): "As an elegiac poet Gray holds for all ages to come his unsailable and sovereign station; as a lyric poet, he is simply unworthy to sit at the feet of Collins."

Mr. Gosse's treatment of Johnson, Goldsmith, Gibbon and Burke will well repay perusal. We could wish the mere mention of many of the minor writers, *nominis parvi umbræ*, absent, and the space given to a fuller treatment of some others who are too briefly passed over, as Sheridan, for example. But we shall not quarrel with the author for this: we are grateful for what we have. As a *history* of literature Mr. Gosse's book seems to include what is wanted in a better manner than Mr. Saintsbury's, but both are valuable additions to the subject and must take their place among the best we have. It is to be hoped that the remaining volumes will speedily appear and will cover their ground equally as well as these, although it may be suggested to Professor Dowden not to try to do too much. In the modern period especially, many names may be relegated to a dictionary of authors that do not deserve a place in a history of literature. What is wanted, and what Professor Dowden is well qualified to give us, judging from his work in Shaksperian criticism, is a compendious statement of the principles of literary criticism, for now we search for it in vain. Each critic seems to be a law unto himself and to follow his own sweet will.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Introduction to Our Early English Literature (from the earliest times to the Norman Conquest). By W. CLARKE ROBINSON, M. A., Ph. D. Heidelberg University; Graduate of the University of France; Lecturer in Modern Literature and Languages in the University of Durham. London, Durham, and Heidelberg, 1885.

Although published five years ago this little book seems unknown on this side of the water. Meantime Professor Robinson has transferred his labors to this country and is a professor in Kenyon College, Ohio. The work consists of an introduction giving "an historical sketch of the Teutonic tribes and settlements in Europe, and of their earliest literature," followed by a brief synopsis of Anglo-Saxon grammar and some remarks on versification. The bulk of the work comprises short extracts, with literary notices and translations, of each poem in Anglo-Saxon literature, so that "Early English" here